

### REMARKS

Claims 21-23 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 2, 13-20, and 24-27 are in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended based on the disclosure at page 7, lines 20-25 and Examples 1(VI), 1(XIII), 1(XVII), 1(XVIII), 2(IV), 3(I), and 4(I).

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 13-23, and 25-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gregorian et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,347,145. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to specify a level of divalent salt of from about 2% to about 90% by weight. Gregorian et al. does not teach or suggest a colour care composition comprising a dye fixing agent and from about 2% to about 90% by weight of a divalent salt. Applicants thus submit that Claims 1, 2, 13-20, and 25-26 are not anticipated by and are patentable over Gregorian et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 1, 2, 13, 16-18, 21, and 25-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Masschelein et al., EP 811,680. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to specify a level of divalent salt of from about 2% to about 90% by weight. Masschelein et al. does not teach or suggest a colour care composition comprising a dye fixing agent and from about 2% to about 90% by weight of a divalent salt. Applicants thus submit that Claims 1, 2, 13, 16-18, and 25-27 are not anticipated by and are patentable over Masschelein et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Claims 1, 2, 13, 16-18, 21, and 25-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al., WO 97/46650. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to specify a level of divalent salt of from about 2% to about 90% by weight. Baker et al. does not teach or suggest a colour care composition comprising a dye fixing agent and from about 2% to about 90% by weight of a divalent salt. Applicants thus submit that Claims 1, 2, 13, 16-18, and 25-27 are not anticipated by and are patentable over Baker et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103


Claims 14, 19, 20, and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al.. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As discussed previously, Baker et al. does not teach or suggest a colour care composition comprising a dye fixing agent and from about 2% to about 90% by weight of a divalent salt. Applicants thus submit that Claims 14, 19, 20, and 24 are not anticipated by and are patentable over Baker et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. M. VERMOTE ET AL.

By   
Jason J. Camp  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 44,582  
(513) 627-8150

January 27, 2002  
CM1883am.doc

**Customer Number: 27752**

FAX RECEIVED  
JAN 28 2003  
GROUP 1700

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 21-23 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1. (Amended) A colour care composition comprising:
  - i)- a dye fixing agent, and
  - ii)- from about 2% to about 90% by weight of a divalent salt.